



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,909	09/22/2003	Richard F. Murphy	1001.1530101	9920
28075	7590	05/18/2007		EXAMINER
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC				KOHARSKI, CHRISTOPHER
1221 NICOLLET AVENUE				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420			3763	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/667,909	MURPHY, RICHARD F.	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2007.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 41-56 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

Examiner acknowledges applicants reply filed 03/19/2007, currently claims 41-56 are currently pending for examination in this application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cohen (5,330,521). Cohen discloses a low resistance implantable electrical lead.

Regarding claim 41, Cohen discloses a medical device including a reinforcing member (42) providing one or more filaments (42) adapted and configured to be made into the reinforcing member for the medical device, the one or more filaments including a metallic surface (col 8, ln 20-30) having an initial surface area, treating at least the portion of the surface (col 9, ln 30-45) to provide a final surface area that is greater than the initial surface area, creating the reinforcing member using the one or more metallic filaments and incorporating the member into a medical device (Figure 4).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 41-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parsi et al. (US2001/0027310) in view of Cohen (5,330,521).

Regarding claims 41-56, Parsi et al. discloses guide catheter (11) with an inner liner and the device being a multi-material layered composite structure. Parsi et al. discloses a catheter comprising a braided (14) metallic filament-reinforcing member (30, [0034]), an inner (16) and outer surface (12) with a lumen extending there through (13). The outer layer and inner layer of the catheter are composed of polymeric materials ([0028]) connected to the metal reinforcing element (Figures 1-7). Parsi et al. meets the claim limitations as described above but does not include a metallic member that is etched to provide a difference in surface area as claimed.

However, Cohen teaches a low resistance implantable electrical lead cable.

Regarding claims 41-56, Cohen teaches a medical device (Figure 2) with a polymeric outer layer outer layer (26, 43), a reinforcement metal filament (22, 42), and a conductive coating layer. Cohen discloses that the metal reinforcement core (22, 42) is

chemically etched before the application of a subsequent material layer (col 6, ln 35-65, col 9, ln 30-45) (Figures 3-4).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use the teachings of Cohen to etch the metal filament of Parsi et al. because it is well known that the etching can be used to clean the material before use and is used to increase adhesion between layers and different materials of a medical device. The references are analogous in the medical device art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Willard or Cohen (col 6, ln 50-70).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 3/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's Representative asserts that the claims are rejected under U.S.C. 102, and subsequently a 103(a), Examiner believes this is typographical error in the heading. Applicant's Representative asserts that the Parsi et al. reference does not disclose the etched wire filament, and Cohen does not disclose a final etched surface area. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Therefore, as further stated in the above office action, Parsi et al. discloses the structural components as claimed by Applicant except the specific surface treatment of the metallic element, Cohen clearly teaches the use of a surface treatment that allows

for the promotion of adhesion of subsequent layers as claimed by Applicant. The prior art of record teaches all elements as claimed and these elements satisfy all structural, functional, operational, and spatial limitations currently in the claims. Therefore the standing rejections are proper and maintained.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Koharski whose telephone number is 571-272-7230. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Date: 5/12/07

  
Christopher D. Koharski  
AU 3763



  
Primary Examiner